

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Application of:) Docket No. MGP.P.US0081
Sisson et al.)
) Art Unit: 1772
)
For: Article Comprising Light) Examiner: Walter V. Aughenbaugh
Absorbent Composition to Mask Visual)
Haze and Related Methods)
)
Serial No. 10/769,167) **I hereby certify that this
Filed: 1/30/2004) correspondence is being facsimile
) transmitted to the United States
) Patent and Trademark Office at
) 571- 273-0025 on _____.**
)
)
) _____
)
Edwin A. Sisson

SUPPLEMENTAL AMENDMENT TO THE SPECIFICATION

TO: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS

Applicants through their attorney, request that the following 32 amendments to the specification be entered. It was discovered in a review of the file wrapper history that many of these amendments were entered on April 4, 2006, however, that amendment was considered non-compliant and the amendment correcting the non-compliance of the claim 81 did not include the specification amendments, therefore it is believed they were not entered. The explanation for each amendment accompanies each point and self explanatory as they are grammar corrections, antecedent grammar (a/an), plural agreement, or trademark attribution, thus there is no new matter added.

Amendment Nos. 24 and 26 deserve note. Amendment 20 was an amendment to the specification entered on March 15, 2008 and changes the typographical error of “2.5%” to the correct value of “0.25%”. Amendment 26 is new but corrects the same error. As noted on March 15, 2008 - That one of ordinary skill knows this to be a typographical error can be found in the paragraph itself and the Table I to which the paragraph refers and the experimental plan in the two preceding paragraphs on page 32. The second preceding paragraph describes that in the experiment that the bottles were evaluated at 0.5, 0.1, 0.2, 0.25, and 0.5 weight percent of the colorant Renol Red. Table I (column 1) lists those same concentrations. The sentence containing the typographical error refers directly to the results listed in Table I, which has a concentration of 0.25%, not 2.5%. The sentence also states that the value for 1.5L bottle was 0.5% and that 0.5% is greater than the value of 0.5L bottle. One of ordinary skill knows that 0.5% is greater than 2.5%. The only way for the statement to be consistent with the data to which it refers (Table I) and the relationships in the sentence is for the value to be 0.25%, which is indeed the minimum value where the haze was masked for the 0.5L bottle as reported in the Table I. Thus there is no new matter added.

Please amend the specification as follows: